REMARKS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 7, 8, and 13 were previously cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein. Claims 1-6, 9-12, and 14-52 are pending, none of which is amended. Claims 1, 24, and 42 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

Examiner Interview

If, during further examination of the present application, a discussion with the Applicant's Representative would advance the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Carl T. Thomsen, at 1-703-208-4030 (direct line) at his convenience.

Drawings

It is gratefully appreciated that the Examiner has accepted the drawings..

Claim for Priority

The Examiner has not acknowledged the Applicant's claim for foreign priority based on EP 03396036.0. Clarification is respectfully requested in the next official communication.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 103(a)

Claim 1-6, 9-12, 14-17 and 24-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Krishnamurthy et al. (U.S. 6,421,676); and claims 18-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnamurthy et al. in view of Blott et al. (U.S. 6,449,618).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Arguments Regarding Independent Claims 1, 24, and 42 as Previously Presented

As best understood by the Applicant, the Examiner has apparently construed independent claims 1, 24, and 42 of the present invention as compared to the teachings of Krisnamurthy et al., such that:

CTOC (406) of Krisnamurthy et al. constitutes *event record* according to the claims of the present invention,

Collectors (108) of Krisnamurthy et al. constitute *self-contained components* according to the claims of the present invention, and

Depot (302) of Krisnamurthy et al. constitutes *buffer* according to the claims of the present invention.

Without admitting other parts of the Examiner's interpretation to be correct, The Applicant first states that the above interpretation is not correct. The *event records* of the present invention are written in *buffers* and in Krisnamurthy et al. the CTOC:s are not written in Depots. Instead, the CTOC:s are written in Input Queues (402) and Output Queues (404).

Now, even assuming that the Input Queues (402) and Output Queues (404) would qualify as *buffers*, Krisnamurthy et al. would still fail to disclose a method according to independent claim 1 of the present invention.

The last step of independent claim 1 recites: "wherein after reading an event record from a buffer, a copy of the event record is retained in the buffer, and removed from the buffer only

after successfully outputting the event record from the reading self-contained component of the mediation layer".

Therefore, this step requires that the event record be successfully passed through the following node before the copy of the event record is removed from the buffer preceding said following node. This feature is not disclosed in Krisnamurthy et al. Instead, in Krisnamurthy et al., the copy is already removed after successfully passing the record to the following node, or using the wording of independent claim 1 of the present invention, the copy of the event record is removed from the buffer already after successfully outputting the event record from the reading self-contained component of the mediation layer.

In the following, this difference is exemplified by writing the above-recited step of independent claim 1 by using the following notions:

reading self-contained component = Collector 108a

preceding self-contained component (the component that writes in the buffer) = Collector 108b

buffer = Output Queue 404 of Collector 108b

event record = CTOC 406

Then, independent claim 1 of the present invention requires that: "wherein after reading CTOC 406 from Output Queue 404 of Collector 108b, a copy of CTOC 406 is retained in Output Queue 404 of Collector 108b, and removed from Output Queue 404 of Collector 108b only after successfully outputting CTOC 406 from Collector 108a of the mediation layer".

On the other hand, column 9, lines 62 to 67 in Krisnamurthy et al. teaches: "After completion of the collection data transfer, output scheduler 432 calls output queue 404 and

removes the CTOC if the transfer was successful. If the collection data transfer failed, the retry count within the CTOC is increased and the CTOC is placed back into the waiting state in output queue 404."

This disclosure confirms that the CTOC:s are removed from the output queues after successfully passing the events to the next node in the sequence of nodes. This procedure may safeguard that data is not lost due to errors in transmission between two nodes. However, this procedure does not prevent loss of data in case the subsequent node in the sequence of nodes falls down. In this case, recovery of any data is dependent solely on the recovery process of the malfunctioning node. In the case of major system fault in the processing node, data can be permanently lost, as confirmed by column 9, lines 45 to 48 in Krisnamurthy et al.

The method according to independent claim 1 removes an event record from a buffer only after the event record has been successfully processed and outputted by the subsequent node in the sequence of nodes. Then, the processed event record is safe in the next buffer or in the target OSS/BSS system, prior to removing the copy from the preceding buffer. Therefore, in a method according to independent claim 1, a sudden failure of a node does not cause loss of data, and the recovery of data is not dependent on the recovery mechanisms of the particular node. Instead, the data is immediately available in the buffer preceding the crashed node and can be processed by an auxiliary node, for instance. Therefore, the method of independent claim 1 is extremely reliable and provides immediate recovery of the processing.

Independent claims 24 and 42 of the present application distinguish over Krishnamurthy et al. (U.S. 6,421,676), at least for the reasons described above.

At least for the reasons explained above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of features set forth in each of independent claims 1, 24, and 42 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Krishnamurthy et al. (U.S. 6,421,676).

Therefore, independent claims 1, 24, and 42 are in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 103(a) are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject claims, but merely to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 208-4030(direct line).

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Date: August 12, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
James M. Slattery
Reg. No. 28,380
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100E
P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

JMS:CTT:ta